

REMARKS

With the present paper, claims 1, 8, and 15 will have been amended to clarify that the announcement storage location is a customer location. Support for the amendment is found, *inter alia*, at paragraph 35 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 20 as being unpatentable over KOCH in view of LEE et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Each independent claim recites analysis of an ID to determine a remote *customer* location where the announcement corresponding to the ID is stored. In contrast, LEE et al. describe a service provider location where the announcement is stored.

Providing the announcement storage at a customer location facilitates the subscriber's announcement modification. For example, the customer location could be the subscriber's PC, which can of course be easily accessed by the customer. LEE et al.'s WTA server is within the service provider's domain and thus provides a less flexible storage, from the subscriber's perspective.

For all of these reasons, it is requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 8, and 15 and provide an indication of their allowability.

Dependent claims 2 – 7, 9 – 14, and 16 - 20 are also believed to recite further patentable subject matter of the invention and therefore are also believed allowable over the prior art. For example, claims 2, 9, and 16 relate to a unique network element that includes a voice interactive media server (VIMS) component, in addition to an IP component. The portion relied upon by the

Examiner (paragraph 36 and Fig. 1) lacks the claimed special equipment, and merely describes standard element having an ordinary IP component. Claims 3, 10, and 17 further recite recognizing that the VIMS component will perform the processing based upon how the announcement ID has been encoded. Not only does KOCH lack the claimed unique network element having a VIMS component, but KOCH also lacks any special encoding that indicates that a VIMS component should perform processing. As such, allowance of the dependent claims is deemed proper for at least the same reasons noted for the independent claims, in addition to reasons related to their own recitations. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and an indication of the allowability of all of the claims in the present application.

The above amendments have been presented merely for the purpose of clarification, and not to overcome the applied prior art. Accordingly, no estoppel is deemed to result from any of the present amendments.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this Reply, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Susanne M. CROCKETT et al.



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

William E. Lyddane
Reg. No. 41,568

May 8, 2006
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191